



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/161,816	09/28/1998	MALCOM B. STRANDBERG	DAVOX-142XX	8075

28452 7590 01/18/2002

BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
835 HANOVER STREET
SUITE 303
MANCHESTER, NH 03104

EXAMINER

AGDEPPA, HECTOR A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

N.Y.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/161,816

Applicant(s)

STRANDBERG, MALCOM B.

Examiner

Hector A. Agdeppa

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

1. Claims 1, 3 – 11, 21 – 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman et al. in view of Srinivasan.

Bateman et al. teaches a method and system for coordinating communications via customer contact channel changing system, using a call center for setting up the call between the customer and an available help agent, wherein a call back is provided from a request over a data path 6 from a data terminal 4, the call back data including a telephone number to be dialed. (Col. 4, line 51 – Col. 5, line 12 and Col. 6, lines 14 – 19) Furthermore, Bateman et al. teaches a server 28 for receiving requests and forwarding call back data to a remotely located outbound dialer system 32 having a HOTLIST wherefrom telephone numbers to be dialed may be retrieved and processed. (Col. 5, lines 35 – 67 and Col. 6, lines 41 – 50)

Bateman et al. also teaches the aforementioned data path being one or a combination of a direct data path, a LAN or WAN, and/or the PSTN. (Fig. 1)

Bateman et al. teaches that the call back request includes customer indicia, a time to call back, and a message, wherein the message may be comprised of voice and/or text and/or DTMF tones. (Col. 6, line 1 – Col. 7, line 13) Note that Bateman et al.

Art Unit: 2642

teaches the use an IVR (interactive voice response) system and it is inherent that in an IVR system a customer may respond by pressing buttons on a conventional telephone i.e. DTMF tones or even when a customer may respond via voice, the voice is converted into DTMF tones for processing by the IVR system.

Bateman et al. further teaches a MMM 50 acting as a call scheduler responsive to the aforementioned HOTLIST for ordering and scheduling the telephone numbers to be dialed at approximately the time designated or scheduled to be called back or even immediately. (Col. 7, lines 28 – 61) Furthermore, depending on the data connection type the customer has, an immediate connection may be made with an available agent over a network with the use of ISDN or SVD, so as to allow for the simultaneous exchange of voice and data and waiting for, for example, a customer to disconnect from a dial-up ISP to allow access to a conventional phone line. (Col. 10, lines 25 – 31)

Bateman et al. also teaches the use of CGI programs. (Col. 5, lines 56 – 60 and Col. 7, lines 28 – 42)

Lastly, Bateman et al. also teaches a "substantially immediate" callback in another embodiment wherein a customer may desire for example, "Live Help" instead of a scheduled callback at a later time. (Col. 6, lines 14 – 29)

What Bateman et al. does not teach is the callback being repetitive when encountering a busy signal.

However, Srinivasan teaches an ACD arrangement for automatically returning a call wherein the return call is repeated until the call goes through or until a certain time-period expires. (Abstract, Col. 2, lines 34 – 36)

Art Unit: 2642

Inasmuch as Bateman and Srinivasan both teach ACD/call center callbacks at predetermined times and because repetitive dialing is very old and well known as shown by Srinivasan, it would have been an obvious choice by one skilled in the art to include such a feature in the invention of Bateman et al. *Repetitive dialing improves the chances of reaching the called party.*

Regarding claim 21, Bateman et al. teaches the use of Internet services with multiple media formats and it is well known to use JAVA over the internet. Therefore it would be an obvious design choice by one skilled in the art whether to use CGI or JAVA so as to allow for the transmission of the call back data over the Internet.

2. Claims 12 – 20, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman et al. in view of Srinivasan and further in view of Szlam et al.

Bateman et al. and Srinivasan have been discussed above. What Bateman et al. and Srinivasan do not teach is a predictive dialer, wherein the predictive dialer having a call pacer. Furthermore, Bateman et al. does not teach appending a non-answered call to a future call campaign.

However, Szlam et al. teaches a method and apparatus for dynamic and interdependent processing of inbound calls and outbound calls, wherein a pacing, predictive dialer is used (Fig. 4 and Col. 11, line 50 – Col. 12, line 7) as well as assigning a call to a next campaign (Col. 9, lines 5 – 8)

It would have been obvious to include the aforementioned features of Szlam et al. in the combination of Bateman et al. and Srinivasan so as to allow for the dynamic

Art Unit: 2642

adjustment of call completion in response to various call scenarios and situations as noted in Columns 2 and 3 of Szlam et al.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hector A. Agdeppa whose telephone number is 703-305-1844. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon thru Fri 9:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on 703-305-4731. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

H.A.A.
January 10, 2002


AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600